

Recognition of the S.V.D. as an Opposition Party and its Leader in the Mysore Legislative Assembly

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before I adjourn the House I would like to make an announcement. As the House is aware, on 30th January 1970.....

2-30 P.M.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Harihar).—Sir, it was agreed between us in your Chambers that before you give your decision you must give an opportunity to us to have our say in the matter. So I would request you to give us an opportunity to express whatever we have got to say in the matter and then you may give your decision.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is true that my hon. Friend Sri Siddaveerappa wanted the matter to be discussed and I told him that it is a matter left to the judicious discretion of the Speaker to recognise or not to recognise the S. V. D. I, however, agreed to give him an opportunity to clarify one or two matters. I think it will be better if I give that opportunity for clarification after I make my announcement.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA—No. The opportunity for clarification should be given first. If you have already come to a decision, then it is left to you give your decision. This subject had come up on the floor of this House not due to us but due you to. Now we want to express our views in the matter and thereafter it is for you to decide in whichever manner you like. So I want you to hear us first. If you have already come to a decision and if our saying here is not going to influence your decision, it is a different matter, but still we insist that we must have our say in the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Regarding what ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ (ಕಾನೂನು, ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕ ಮತ್ತು ಸಾಂಸದಿಕ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಎದು ಮೊಗುಂ ಆಗಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲಸ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ನಿವ್ವವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಮೊಗುಂ ಕೆಲಸ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ನಿಮ್ಮದು. ಮೊಗುಂ ಕೆಲಸ ನಿಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರದೇ ಹೊರತು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am willing to give some time to the hon. Member Sri Siddaveerappa. The only question before me is whether the S. V. D. should be recognised or not. I have already had the benefit of hearing Sri Siddaveerappa and other members of his party on this matter. I have given very careful consideration to all the points that were raised by them. In addition to that, if the Hon. Leader of the Party wants to bring to my notice any fresh points which should weigh with me in deciding the matter, he may do so within a couple of minutes.

Sri R. DAYANANDA SAGAR (Chamarjapet).—You cannot restrict like that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall hear only the Leader of the party.

Sri R. DAYANANDA SAGAR.—You cannot shut out other members.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This is a matter left to my judicious discretion and so I shall hear only the Leader of the Party for a short time.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Periyapatna).—With your permission.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not going to hear anybody else on the subject.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I am not speaking on the subject.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall hear only the Leader and nobody else.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—You may hear only the Leader and nobody else. I only wanted to bring to your notice the assurance that you held out earlier that you would give an opportunity to some of us to express our views.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—You did say that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I did not say that. I said I would give some opportunity for clarification.

Sri R. DAYANANDA SAGAR—You held out an assurance that you would give opportunity to some of us.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No. I had promised only the Leader and in fulfilment of that promise I am giving him an opportunity.

Sri R. DAYANANDA SAGAR.—Kindly keep up your promise.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I gave an assurance that if hon. Members so desire they may seek some clarifications. I stand by that promise and accordingly I am now allowing the Leader of the Party Mr. Siddaveerappa to speak.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I rise to a point of order, Sir. Just now the Speaker told the House that he is going to make some announcement. I fail to understand what is there on the agenda on which you are calling some Leaders to speak on some subject. We are not aware of anything or any business to be considered on the floor of the House now. So I would request you to please make your announcement and let us know what it is and then we can hear the Leader or whomsoever you may call to speak. So I request you to uphold my point of order and first make the announcement and then we will be in a position to know what is the thing that is going on in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is about recognition of whether the S.V.D. Party should be recognised or not. My friends Sri Siddaveerappa and some others came to me and wanted that they should be heard.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—We came to you at your request.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Why don't you please state the facts correctly? He did not ask for any interview with you.

'Sri H. SIDDHAVEERAPPA.—I never came on my own. I came to you only at your request.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I fail to understand the impatience of hon. Members. It is no doubt true that the hon. Member come to me at my request. I heard their arguments clearly regarding the subject-matter and told them about the decision that I proposed to take in the matter. Hon' member Sri Siddaveerappa wanted one or two things, I Therefore permit him only to say a few words.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಚೆನ್ನಯ್ಯ (ಕೃಷ್ಣ ರಾಜ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಬೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri R. DAYANANDA SAGAR.—Sir, I rise to a Point of Order. The other day some of us came to your chambers and had discussion regarding this question, but we did not come to any agreement. Then, you were good enough to assure us that you will allow some discussion on this subject, and now you are going to give a decision of your own. We do not object to your decision. But, we request you to keep up to your word, and allow us to have our say.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no Point of Order.

Sri R. DAYANANDA SAGAR.—If you want to break your own word, I have no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon. Member need not be excited. I had promised that some time would be given for clarifications. Therefore, I am permitting the leader of the party Sri Siddaveerappa to have his say.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಚೆನ್ನಯ್ಯ.—ಅವತ್ತು ನಾವು ಸೇರಿದಾಗ್ಗೆ ನಿವ್ವ ವಿರಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಬೇರೆ ಎನೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ತಾವು ಹೇಳುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂದು ನಮಗೆ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಎನಾದರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾವೂ ಸಹ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು, ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫೈ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಿವ್ವ ವಿರಪ್ಪನವರು ಒಬ್ಬರೇ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಅಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಶ್ರೀ ನಿವ್ವ ವಿರಪ್ಪನವರಿಗಷ್ಟೇ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಮುಗಂ ಅಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಗನೈಜ್ಜ ಪಾಟೀ ಇವೆ, ನಿವ್ವ ವಿರಪ್ಪನವರು ಲೇಡರ್ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ, ಏನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಲೇಡರ್ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ ಇದು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಷಯ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಎನಾದರೂ ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಲೇಡರ್‌ರಾದ ನಿವ್ವ ವಿರಪ್ಪನವರು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಸಾಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಚೆನ್ನಯ್ಯ.—ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಮಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇರೆ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್ (ಹುಬ್ಬಳ್ಳಿ).—ತಮ್ಮ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಬಂಧನಕಾರಕ ವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕೇಳದೇ ಮಾಡಿದ ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಬಂಧನಕಾರಕ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಪಕ್ಷಗಳು ಇವೆ. ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಎರಡು ಪಕ್ಷಗಳಿವೆ, ಪ್ರಜಾ ಸೋಷಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಕ್ಷ ಇದೆ, ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರ ಪಕ್ಷ ಇದೆ, ಕಮ್ಯುನಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಕ್ಷ ಇದೆ, ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಎಕೀಕರಣ ಪಕ್ಷ ಇದೆ, ರೋಕ ಸೇವಕ ಸಂಘ ಪಕ್ಷ ಇದೆ, ಇದರಿಂದ ಈ ಎಲ್ಲ ಪಕ್ಷಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಡೆಮಾಕ್ರಸಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕಾ ತರುತ್ತೀರಿ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.— ಲೇಡರ್ ಆದವರು ಹೇಳಲಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಎಲ್ಲ ಪಕ್ಷಗಳ ಲೀಡರ್‌ರನ್ನೂ ಕೇಳಿ.

MR. SPEAKER.—There cannot be any discussion on this matter ; it is a matter which is within the judicious discretion of the Speaker, and after following all the principles and guide-lines laid down by the Speaker's Conference, I have come to the conclusion. The other day, I only promised to give some time for clarifications. I shall hear the leader of the party and then decide the matter.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—Sir, I am also a member of the executive committee, but I know nothing about what Transpired in Hon. Speaker's Chambers. Let it not be taken for granted that I have conceded everything.

Sri N. CHIKKE GOWDA (Hoskote).—Sir, I rise to a Point of Order. You were pleased to say that it is a matter to be decided by the Speaker because it is within your judicious discretion. Such being the case, why did you call for a few people apart from the leader ? You could have decided the matter on the merits of the case. We do not know what has happened in your chambers. I feel the hon. Members should be allowed to have their say in the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no Point of Order. Before deciding the issue, I wanted to hear the hon'ble leader Sri Siddaveerappa and therefore I sent for him. Some colleagues came with him and I had to welcome them. The matter should rest there. I do not want to take the valuable time of the House. I have already circulated my views to the leaders of parties.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I rise to a Point of Order. Any decision or ruling that the Speaker should give shall be in conformity with the Rules of Procedure and approved by this House. Any decision given contrary to the rules will not be valid and will be out of order. We do not know what exactly are the rules you are adopting in this case. You made a reference that there are some precedents or rules framed by the Speakers' Conference. We do not know those rules and decisions. The other day when we were in your chambers, you promised to send us a copy of the decisions taken at the Speakers' Conference as a sort of guide lines to all the members so that we may assess their value and whether they are in conformity with the rules. In the absence of those decisions before us, it would not be correct on your part to give a decision in this case.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no Point of Order. I have sent type 1 copies of the decessions of speakers' conference to the leaders of parties.

I now call upon Sri Siddaveerappa to briefly state his points.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, you will bear with me if I take a little more time. I would like to make one point clear. I wish to say at the very outset that I have nothing to say against any hon. Member of the Opposition sitting on this side to whatever party he may belong. I cherish the same love, affection and the same friendship to them as I

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA)

had before we formed our own party, and on the point at issue whatever I have got to say will not have any reference to them. As you are aware, it is better to be retrospective in these matters. When this Assembly first met in the year 1967 after the General Elections, with a view to develop a healthy democratic opposition party, although there were multiple parties, we formed one group and came forward with a proposal by giving office bearers, etc., and asked for recognition of the S. V. D. But, for various reasons that party was not recognised. Though we worked for three years on that basis, it was only a sort of a *de facto* arrangement. There was no common programme: there was no minimum programme, and not even the names were given. It continued for nearly three years, and it is a fact. When we approached the late Sri Baliga, he refused to recognise that party—S. V. D. We had 89 members then. Our new party was formed on 19-1-1970 when we were sufficiently numerically strong to act as an opposition, as a single party with a single common programme and a single leadership. On 20-1-1970 in the usual course, I wrote to you, Sir, stating that our party, being the largest party in the Assembly on the opposition side is eligible for recognition as the official opposition party, and I requested you to recognise our party accordingly. You asked me to give the names of office bearers, the common programme, etc. and I gave it on 21-1-1970. And, we were keeping quiet all these days. I learnt that on 23-1-1970 Sri Sharana Gowda wrote a letter to you stating that there is the S. V. D. in existence and that S. V. D. may be continued here on the floor of this House. I also learnt that on 2-2-1970, under the signature of my friend Sri L. Srikantaiah, a letter was written to you stating that as many as 43 hon. members have affixed their signature and they wanted the old S. V. D. to continue. Here, the point for your judicious decision is whether there was any S. V. D. in existence. Do you recognise that there was a S. V. D. in existence or it was a sort of *ad hoc* party that continued? So far as I am concerned, I deliberately refrained from making any efforts either directly or indirectly. I never came and approached you and requested you to make me the Leader of the Opposition. I was keeping quiet. Some friends on the other side wanted to create some trouble. We said that our application is pending for a very long time for separate seating arrangement. Then what happened? Without our asking, without any prompting on our part, you announced one day stating that our party being the largest party numerically, for the time being, is recognised as the official opposition and its leader as the Leader of the Opposition. Let it be made known that, that was 'apparrathitha'. I never asked you to do it. My interest was only to see that my party was recognised. At that time, I saw the Leader of the House standing immediately upon his legs, as if bitten by a scorpion, stating: well what has happened—why this party has been recognised as the opposition party, as the largest party? I do not know what transpired and I never expected that such a thing would

happen. I expected that you would take a judicious decision. Subsequently, I learn that Sri S. Sivappa has written to you stating that they have given a common programme. I think you have gone through it.

3-00 P.M.

I was in Davanagere. I was informed on telephone that you wanted to see me on 16th. I requested from Davanagere that you might see me on 18th and I shall be coming along with some friends of my party. You were pleased to see me. We had a lengthy discussion. Two other hon. Members of the opposition were also there and we said we want a private audience with you. And after two hours you were pleased to say that you have got a list of Members—MLAs and you do not want to say whether they belonged to PSP or SSP, or other parties. You said they were individual members of the Assembly and they have formed into a party with a common purpose which according to you is sufficient which we said may not be the way that common purpose and object would be put and what all we said was, when you consider it, do you consider it as a step towards the growth of healthy democracy. If according to you, you are not recognising all these parties and you are only recognising them as MLAs, then you are not encouraging democratic parties to grow, but individuals to grow as a party. This is a matter which you should recognise. Whatever it is, we take it cheerfully. As a matter of fact, none of us wanted to occupy the place on this side. That is not the place which we covet. If at all, we covet the place on the other side, we are not interested in having any place on this side at all—whether it is the second seat or the third seat. Therefore, for the first time, what is it that the country has seen? The country has seen that the Congress Party in power is intolerant of any other party, which was the largest numerically, even to function as the official opposition in this House. So many things have taken place. I am sorry, you said a sort of thing the other day, which I wanted to instantaneously refute. You said that even within one hour if some other party comes to me, I am going to recognise. I could not relish that idea. I only wanted to say that I had a feeling that there was some conspiracy going on to see that we were ridiculed by making us to sit there for an hour or two and then unseated. We are not interested in that way. You would have done greater service to us if by your ruling you were recognising us as the official opposition. We were not gladder for it. I have made it very clear. I make it very clear now. I only say that this is not the way that a party which is the largest numerically, should be treated. The Leader of the House says that he wants the entire country to be behind him; but if this is the way, things are managed behind our back—to cavil at us—I feel this is not the way, Love begets love. That is not the way co-operation can be asked. I therefore feel, whatever may be your ruling, I do not wish to take much of your time. Whatever it is, you are not helping growth of democracy and democratic parties to grow in this country. You want

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA)

to exercise your judicious discretion. I wish you had done so on the very day we gave our application to you. If you had simply recognised and if these things had happened subsequently, it was a different matter. In parliament, as you have seen, for the first time in the history of India, a party was recognised as the official Opposition Party under Dr. Ramsubhag Singh, because that was the largest party numerically in Parliament. On the very day I gave my request to you, what did you do here? We were not recognised. Then it went on, twisting and spinning. I need not go into them, because they will be evident if you go through the documents, I need not go into them. My only submission is, if all these things are done only to see that our party is insulted or ridiculed, I would like to tell him that our reaction is exactly the opposite. I personally feel that is what has happened. Now I leave it to you. I am only saying that so far as my party is concerned—I am happy and proud, it may be one day or one hour, of having been the Opposition Party in the history of this Legislature. That pride of place cannot be denied to our party. You may dispossess us of it today. We are not bothered. We were the first official opposition *De jure* that has been recognised in the House. *De facto* there may be very many. Therefore, I wish to submit that since you have already come with your decision, I do not know whether I am going to influence your decision. Probably I am not. But I am not in the least bothered. I am only saying that on the very day on which we stood up in connection with the no confidence motion tabled by one of our hon. Members of this House, what happened here you have seen it. If this is the punishment for having taken up the case of no confidence motion against you, we cheerfully bear it. That is all what I have got to say, whomsoever you declare as the Leader of the Opposition, so far as State matters are concerned, we will be one with them. But I cannot sufficiently condemn the attitude and the ways and methods adopted by the party that is in power in this sordid affair. If this gives them any sadistic satisfaction, let them have it.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL (Chief Minister).—May I say a word, Sir?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಬಿ. ಜವ್ಹರನಯ್ಯ (ಹಾಸನ).—ಈಗ ನಾಯಕತ್ವ ವಿಧಾಯಕ ದಳದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಒಂದೆರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ತಾವು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಅವಕಾಶ ವನ್ನೇ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು ಈ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಟೀಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಾದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಟೀಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಅವಶ್ಯಕ ಏದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದು ನಿದ್ರೆ ಎಂದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall hear only leaders of the various parties and nobody else.

ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ತಾವು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ನಾನು ಬೇಡ ಅನ್ನುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವೂ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಿ.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN (Malleswram).—On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There can be no point of order when the Chair is on its legs.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—Even before the Chair stood up, I stood up on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Instead of hearing everybody, I thought I should in fairness hear only the leaders of the other parties. One leader has already spoken; the Leader of the House may speak and the leader of the S.V.D. also may speak. It is not necessary for everybody to speak. We are losing time.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮೀ ನನ್ನದೊಂದು ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಇದೆ. ತಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೇಳಿದಾಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ಅಪೊಸಿಷನ್ ಲೇಡರು ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ತಾವು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಅವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ನಭೆಯು ಲೇಡರ್‌ರವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಎಸ್ ವಿ ಡಿ ಲೇಡರ್ ರವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಇತರರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ನಮಗೂ ತಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The principle that I am following is to allow the leaders of the parties to speak.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ.—ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, ತಾವು ಈಗತಾನೆ ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಇತರರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ತಾವು ಲೇಡರ್ ಆಫ್ ದಿ ಹೌಸ್‌ರವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರಿ. ಇದಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಎಸ್ ವಿ ಡಿ ಲೇಡರ್ ರವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಹಾಗೆ ಇತರರಿಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದಾದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ಕೆಲವು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಿ. ಬೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಇತರರಿಗೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಿ.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—Sir, the hon. Members are aware that a controversy is going on as to who should be recognised as the Leader of the Opposition in this House.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS.—No, no.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Does the Chair agree with the statement of the Hon. Leader of the House?

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—I have every right to say what I want to say. When the hon. Member Sri Siddaveerappa was expressing his views, I did not interrupt him. I am telling this because during the last Assembly session this was going on.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ.—ಇದೇನೂ ಅಂತಹ ದೊಡ್ಡ ವಿಷಯವಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಪದೇ ಪದೇ ಇಂಟರ್‌ಪ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಇದು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—I cannot understand this hon. Member standing up every time and interrupting me. I am the Leader of the House and I have every right to express my views and no Member has a right to interrupt me.

Sri S. CHANNIAH.—He cannot say that; it is for the Chair to say that.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The Hon. Leader of the House is saying things which I have not said. Thereby he is trying to impute a motive to me in regard to the controversy and all that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon. Member Sri Siddaveerappa made certain allegations in his speech against the leader of the House and the Ruling Party. If the Hon. leader of the House wants to express certain things, it is not proper on my point to shut him out?

Sri K. H. PATIL.—On a point of order, Sir. the Hon. Leader of the House said that no Member has a right to interrupt him. Does he want to convert this House also just as it happened in Gulbarga where he wanted to rule by his threat?

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no point of order.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Sir, I rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let the hon. Member give notice of it in writing and I shall consider it.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—There are precedents in this House where notices of privilege have been given orally by the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The Hon. Chief Minister in his opening remarks made a statement which the Chair can verify that there is a controversy as to who is to be the Leader of the Opposition. But the Hon. Chief Minister knows that the hon. Member Sri Siddaveerappa has been declared by the Chair in this august House as the Leader of the Opposition and he still continues to be the Leader of the Opposition till today...

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—As against his point of privilege I rise on a point of order, Sir. No doubt, My friend Sri Channabasappa can raise a point of privilege even without giving a motion in writing and he has now stated his motion.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Not yet.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—He has raised it and he is now proceeding to explain it. Unless the Chair gives the consent, he has not be allowed to explain. This is my point of order.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—My point of privilege is that the Hon. Chief Minister has acted in a manner which would offend the privilege of the Leader of the Opposition Sri Siddaveerappa by making a false statement, namely, that there is a controversy about the leadership of the Opposition, while actually there is no controversy about it as things stand today.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point of privilege raised by the hon. Member is that the Chief Minister said that there is a controversy in this matter.

He was not allowed to have his say I don't think he has said anything in an insulting manner. Probably he was tracing the history of the recognition of the Opposition Leader from the very beginning. Unless he is given an opportunity to say what he wants to say, it is very difficult to decide matters. I therefore hold that there is no point of privilege.

† Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—Sir, as the Hon. Chair has rightly pointed out, I was tracing the history. Without allowing me to have my say, if the hon. Members jump to conclusions, it becomes very difficult for me. Before I proceed with this matter, I have to beg you humbly to recollect that the Hon. Chair asked me twice to have my say and I stood up. But I was made to sit in preference to a Member of this House; he may be a senior Member or any Member. But even then, I respected the Chair and sat down; I did not grudge at all. But I feel, whoever may be the Leader of the House, he must be given sufficient opportunity to have his say in this House.

About this matter as to who should be declared the Leader of the Opposition, I was tracing the history. That is why, I cautiously used the words "has been" and stated that there has been controversy; I never stated that there is controversy. In this very House, I think during the last Assembly Session period, twice, thrice, this matter was raised and several Members were indignant that you have been delaying and that you should make a declaration as early as possible. Even then I did not open my lips. I did not say anything because even to-day I honestly feel that the matter as to who should be declared or recognised as the Leader of the Opposition, is entirely left to the Hon. Speaker. It is not at all a matter for us to decide. So far as we on this side are concerned, we are least interested in this; we are not at all interested. You know we remained so even at the time of your declaration of Sri Siddaveerappa as Leader of the Opposition. You are a better judge. You know I never talked to you on any day; I have never talked to you about it; not a single day I have talked to you about this. To be fair to Sri Sivappa, I must say that Sri Sivappa never approached me. I too did not approach him directly or indirectly. Till to this hour, I can say with all sincerity and honesty at my command that we have nothing to do with it. We are least interested in it and nobody has approached us. In spite of this fact, I am very very sorry and it is most unfortunate that hon. Member Sri Siddaveerappa should direct all his guns against me. He does not want to waste any opportunity to direct his guns against me and the ruling party. Even now, I would like to reiterate with all the sincerity and honesty at my command that we have no say in this matter, that there is no back-door method, that there is no arrangement or any sort of negotiation with any leader of the opposition party. Till to this hour, I do not think I have talked this subject either with Sri Sivappa or any member of the Opposition; because I feel that this is a matter purely for the Chair to decide. Whatever you decide, we are here to

(SRI VEERENDRA PATIL)

welcome it. I humbly submit that we have not negotiated with anybody. We are awaiting your decision in this matter. We do not know what is going to be your declaration. That is why, I said that we are awaiting your decision, I was not following Sri Siddaveerappa and actually I do not know even what Sri Siddaveerappa spoke. Sri Koujalgi has come from Delhi and I was anxious to know what happened in Delhi and what the latest developments were. But when I heard the last portion of his speech, I felt that it was most unfortunate that he was attributing motives to the Leader of the House.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Let him peruse the proceedings.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—If I have said anything, it is there on record. Till the time you made a declaration, I did not open my lips. Even now I was not at all interested in it. I was just waiting for you to make the declaration because if you declare the name of the Leader of the Opposition, it is my duty to congratulate him and welcome him. That is why, I was waiting here. Otherwise, I had pressing engagements.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I never wanted him to welcome me. I never depended upon it.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—Whether it was welcomed by the hon. Member or not, according to me, as Leader of the House, I am expected to set up healthy precedents so that they may be followed in future also; A healthy precedent is very necessary. I humbly felt that hon. Member and his colleagues should not have attributed motives in a matter which is purely within your province to decide. We are here to bow down to your decision and accordingly.....

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I hope the Hon. Chief Minister will not take away the leadership of my party.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have heard the hon. leader Sri Siddaveerappa and the Leader of the House. I am particularly aware of the arguments advanced by Sri Siddaveerappa as they were made known to me earlier. At my request, he met me with some of his colleagues and there was discussion *in extenso*. Nothing new has been stated now. But I feel that my hon. friend Sri Siddaveerappa has made a very uncharitable reference to me in the concluding portion of his speech. He has surmised that because he and some others of his party stood in support of the Non-confidence Motion brought against me, I am giving a different decision. Well, it was very wrong on his part to have made that reference; it is more surprising because it should have been made by Sri Siddaveerappa who is very well aware that I shall continue here during the pleasure of the House and not at anybody's mercy. The House is supreme. There were occasions when bitter attacks were made against the Chair. Even then, I ignored them in the hope that at some time

in future healthy conventions would develop. I want to assure Sri Siddaveerappa and others that I will never bring personal matters or personal predilections to bear on the decision of the issues that arise from time to time. My approach is absolutely impersonal. I hope Sri Siddaveerappa will coolly consider and will withdraw the personal reference he made to me.

Secondly I wish to bring to the notice of hon. Members that I have no desire to play politics. More is there any scope for playing politics. Any issue that comes up before the House will always be decided on the basis of principles and guidelines enunciated and evolved by this House. These guidelines have been made known to all the Members including my hon. friend Sri Siddaveerappa.

I think it will be better to trace the history relating to the according of recognition to opposition parties. On an earlier occasion, a request was made by some of the hon. Members who formed themselves into a party, to my Hon. illustrious predecessor that their party may be recognised as the Opposition Party in the House on the ground that they had formulated a common programme and that they had furnished a list of office bearers and members. Although late Sri Baliga assured them that he would seriously consider their representation, no decision was taken. All the same, or the United Opposition Legislature Party continued as *de facto* opposition party under the *de facto* leadership of Sri S. Sivappa.

Subsequently on 20th January 1970 I received a note from Sri Siddaveerappa to the effect that his party being the largest party, it should be recognised as the Opposition Party. Then I requested Sri Siddaveerappa to furnish the names of members of his party together with the names of office bearers and common programme. I also told him that I will consider his request after receiving that information from him. In the meantime, I was informed by Sriyutha Sharana Gowda, Srikantiah and others that they have formed a Samyuktha Vidayak Dhal. On 21st Sri Siddaveerappa gave a list of 23 members. As things are changing from time to time I wanted to give time for things to settle down. I therefore, requested Sri Siddaveerappa to wait for two or three days.

3-30 P.M.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I never pressed for it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Siddaveerappa agreed for this. Then this matter went on up to 27th. Sri Siddaveerappa stated on that day that members of his party waited for a long time and his party had a legitimate grievance that the Speaker did not act in time. I stated that this question will be taken up on 30th immediately after the Question Hour.

As the House is aware, on 30th January 1970, I recognised Congress (R) Party as an opposition party in the House and its leader

(MR. SPEAKER)

Sri H. Siddaveerappa was recognised as the leader of the opposition for the time being. I added that I had received another request from the office bearers of the Samyuktha Vidhayak Dal with a list of about 37 or 38 Members for recognition of their party in the House. Since certain particulars required for recognition were lacking, I requested them to furnish the required particulars to enable me to consider their request. On 3rd February, 1970 a list containing 43 members was received from Sri L. Srikanthaiah. In the covering letter, it was stated that Sri S. Sivappa would continue to be the leader of the S. V. D. and that Sri Sarana Gowda and Sri Bhaskara Setty as Secretary and Joint Whip respectively pending election of the new office bearers. I announced this fact also to the House on the same day and stated that I would examine the question of recognising the S. V. D.

I have carefully examined the matter. Sri L. Srikanthaiah has enclosed the Constitution of the S. V. D. and its minimum programme to be followed on the Floor of the House. Agreement forms from the individual members saying that they wish to join S. V. D. and that they will work in the Assembly according to the Constitution and the minimum programme of the S. V. D. are also enclosed. Subsequently, Sri S. Shivappa has written to me that he has agreed to join the S. V. D. and that he is prepared to shoulder the responsibility of the Leadership of the Party.

The question of recognition of a United front on the Floor of the Legislative Assembly came before late Sri Baliga, as early as 16th March, 1967. The members of the opposition, consisting of P. S. P., S. S. P., Swatantra, L. S. S., Jansangh, Janatha Party, Communists and some other independent members represented to the Speaker that they be recognised as United Opposition Legislature Party. The names of office bearers were also given. For one reason or the other, that party was not officially recognised on the Floor of the House. However, Sri S. Sivappa functioned as *de facto* leader of the opposition.

The late Sri Mavalankar, former Speaker of Lok Sabha, has laid down the following directions for recognising a Party as an opposition party in the House :

In recognising a Parliamentary Party or Group, the Speaker shall take into consideration the following principles :—

“(i) An Association of members who propose to form a Parliamentary Party:—

- (a) shall have announced at the time of the general election, a distinct ideology and programme for Parliamentary work on which they have been returned to the House ;
- (b) shall have an organisation both inside and outside the House ; and

- (c) shall have at least a strength equal to the quorum fixed to constitute a sitting of the House, that is, one-tenth of the total number of members of the House.
- (ii) An Association of members to form a Parliamentary Group shall satisfy the conditions specified in parts (a) and (b) of clause (i) and shall have atleast a strength of 30 members."

After the last general elections in 1967, the political scene of the country has changed considerably. In several States, different parties and groups have joined together to form what are popularly known as United Fronts. The Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies have considered this problem and have laid down the following guide lines for the Presiding Officers in respect of according recognition to the Political parties in the light of the new situation :

"If the constituent Groups forming a Party for the purpose of proper functioning of the House with a view to strengthening Parliamentary democracy have a common programme of parliamentary Work, a common organisation, and have one Leader and one Whip to speak on their behalf inside the House, there is no objection to necessary recognition being given to that Party. This applies to both the Government and Opposition Parties and no distinction can be made between a Government Party and an Opposition Party similarly formed."

No single party in opposition is in majority. Taking into consideration all these things prevailing now-a-days, the Presiding Officers' Conference recommended :

"That a party or Group having the requisite strength in the House, i.e., strength equal to the strength of the quorum in the case of a party and 3/5th thereof in the case of a group, while applying to the Speaker for recognition should state its Parliamentary programme, the names of its Leader, Deputy Leader, Whip, Secretary, etc., and also attach the signatures of all the members of the party/group in token of their being members thereof. Only after all these requirements are complied with, the Speaker should consider the request and recognise it as a party."

There is another recommendation about the recognition of the Opposition Leader.

It says like this ;

"The Committee recommend that the Leader of the largest recognised Opposition Party (whether a regular party or a party composed of different parties or groups) should be recognised as the leader of the Opposition."

(MR. SPEAKER)

In view of this it is possible there may be a regular party in Opposition or any group of various independent members and parties in it.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—In the absence of a single party with a common programme, there are other parties. Even in Lok Sabha Sri Ram Subhag Singh's party was recognised on the very first day. The claims of other parties could have been considered.

MR. SPEAKER.—If all the parties come together in the Lok Sabha, I am sure the Speaker of the Lok Sabha will recognise it. It is possible that a party consisting of various groups could be recognised in the absence of a single largest party with common programme.

I have, therefore, considered the request of the 43 members for recognition as Samyuktha Vidhayak Dal on the Floor of the Legislative Assembly in the light of the principles stated above. They have furnished a common programme of Parliamentary work and have one leader and one Whip to speak on their behalf inside the House. The strength of the Association of members is more than the quorum required for a meeting of the Assembly.

I, therefore, recognise the samyuktha Vidhayak Dal as an Opposition Party in the House. Further, since the strength of this party is more than the Congress (R) which has already been recognised, I recognise the Samyuktha Vidhayak Dal as the main Opposition Party and its leader Sri S. Sivappa, M. L. A., as the Leader of the Opposition in the House.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪೀರೇಂದ್ರ ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಈಗ ನಾನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಮಯ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನವರು ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರೆಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಘೋಷಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಅದನ್ನು ಹಾರ್ದಿಕವಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಐಬ್ಲ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷ ಸಂಯುಕ್ತ ವಿಧಾಯಕ ದಳ ಎಂದು ರೆಕಗ್ನೈಜ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರ ಪಕ್ಷ, ಪಿ ಎನ್ ಪಿ, ಜನತಾ ಪಕ್ಷ ಮುಂತಾದುವು ಸೇರಿವೆ. ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ (ಆರ್) ಎಂದು ಬೇರೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

My point is whether you have recognised all the Parties or you have recognised only Congress (R) Party and the S. V. D. in this House. That is the point on which clarification is necessary from the Chair.

Secondly, I have to submit to the Chair that I am a Member of the Executive of the S. V. D. which has submitted you the list.

MR. SPEAKER.—I rule that there is no point of order. The hon. Member wanted to know how many parties are recognised. So far as the question of recognising parties in the Opposition is concerned, I have recognised the S.V.D. as the main Opposition Party with Sri S. Sivappa as its leader. I have recognised also the Congress (R) Party as another Opposition Party next in strength to the S. V. D. So far as the Opposition Parties are concerned, I have not recognised any other Party.

Now with respect of the constituents or the Groups forming the S. V. D. so far as the functioning of the S. V. D. is concerned, all the groups have merged themselves into the S. V. D. They may have got their separate entity outside the House and they may be free to hold their separate ideologies outside the House. But so far as functioning inside the House is concerned, I recognise only the S. V. D. and not the constituents or Groups constituting the S. V. D.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೀರೇಂದ್ರ ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಈಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನವರನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರೆಂದು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಘೋಷಿಸಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಹೃತ್ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳೆದ 7-8 ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಹಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಅವರು ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಸಹಕಾರ ನೀಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಅನೇಕ ವೇಳೆ ಬಹಳ ರಚನಾತ್ಮಕವಾದ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—I rise to a point of order. You were pleased to state that you recognised only two Parties, namely the S. V. D. and the Congress (R) and that you cannot recognise any other political party or group constituting the S. V. D. For your information I would like to say that we have not lost our individuality. We have not surrendered our individuality. We have joined the S. V. D. for the sake of convenience to help you and to present to you a single united opposition party in this House, but that cannot be taken to mean that we have lost our individuality.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not find there is any point of order and the statement I have made stands. For a party to be recognised there should be a minimum number of 22 members and for recognition of a group the minimum number of members should be 13. The S. V. D. has been recognised as an opposition party for the purposes of seating arrangements and functions of this House. The constituent parties may have their own ideologies outside the House. So far as the functioning in this House is concerned, I recognise the S. V. D. as a party and its Leader Sri Sivappa will have the right to enforce discipline in this House on the members of the S. V. D. I recognise only S. V. D. and the Congress-(R) and no other parties.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ಎಸ್. ವಿ. ಡಿ. ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದು ಮಿನಿಮಂ ಪ್ರೋಗ್ರಾಂ ಮೇರೆ, ಅಪ್ಪರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ. ಅಂಥ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಬಂದಾಗ ನಾವು ಎಸ್. ವಿ. ಡಿ. ಯಂತೆ ವರ್ತಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಬಂದಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ನಿಲುವು ಬೇರೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷವೆ ನಿಲುವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ತರಹ ಬಾಧಕವೂ ಇರಲಾರದು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have made the whole thing very clear. Since S. V. D. has satisfied certain requirements, I have recognised it as a single largest party in Opposition. I have not recognised any party or groups constituting S. V. D.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೀರೇಂದ್ರ ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷ ರೇ, ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನವರು ಅನೇಕ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ, ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಿಂದ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಸೇವೆ ಸಲ್ಲುತ್ತಿದೆ, ರಚನಾತ್ಮಕವಾದ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೂ ಅವರು ಈಹೊತ್ತೂ

(ಶ್ರೀ ವೀರೇಂದ್ರ ಪಾಟೀಲ್)

ಹಿಂತೆಗೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಸತ್ಯವಾಗಿ ತೋರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಎಂದು ಘೋಷಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನಾನು ಅದನ್ನು ತುಂಬಿದ ಹೃದಯದಿಂದ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅವೇ ರೀತಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು 1967ರಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಬಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಪ್ರಮಾಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಡಿಬೇಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಂಟ್ರಿಬ್ಯೂಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ರಚನಾತ್ಮಕವಾದ ಸಂಕೇತಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಆಸಕ್ತದ ಅನುಭವವಿದೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಜಟಿಲವಾದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ, ಸಹಕಾರ ನೀಡುತ್ತ ಬಂದರೋ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂವೆಯೂ ನೀಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಾನು ನಂಬಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ಹೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ ಅಭಿನಂದನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಾಗತ ಮಾಡಿ ನನ್ನ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಮಾತು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, now that you have recognised my hon'ble friend Sri S. Sivappa as the Leader of the S.V.D. and the Leader of the Opposition, it is my privilege to extend a hearty welcome to him as the Leader of Opposition. In the State of Mysore probably there is no other person who has enjoyed the position of the Leader of Opposition for such a long time except Sri Sivappa. He knows the job very well. He is more flexible and he must be much more useful to the Government.

I know Sri Sivappa much better than anybody else. He is a gentleman. But under the circumstances I know his leanings, his promptings and various other things. Unfortunately, on the other day when the Hon'ble Speaker declared our party I felt that you had selected a time when Sri Sivappa had left to Baroda. I want to see that democratic forces should develop and the country should progress. In the interest of the State I can assure hon'ble Sri Sivappa that our party will consider each issue on its merit and take a decision and will extend our support to him and our party will never go against the interests of the State.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ (ಶ್ರೀಮಾಜಿಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ).—ಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರೇ, ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕತ್ವವನ್ನು ನನಗೆ ವಹಿಸಿ ಈ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಸಂದಿಗ್ಧ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಭಿವರ್ಧನಾತ್ಮಕವಾದ ಆವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಹೊರೆಯನ್ನು ನನ್ನ ತಲೆಯಮೇಲೆ ಹೊರಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಈ ಹೊತ್ತು ಇಂದಿರಾ ದೇಶಪಾಲ್ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಾವತನೆ ಎಷ್ಟೊಂದು ವೇಗವಾಗಿ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಅರಿತು ನಾನು ಪುನಃ ಎಸ್.ಎ.ಡಿ. ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕನಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡೆ. ಸಂಯುಕ್ತ ವಿಧಾಯಕ ದಳದ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಆಯಿತು ಎಂದರೆ 1967ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಕ್ಷ 24 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನೊಳಗೊಂಡು ತಾನೇ ತಾನಾಗಿ ಅಧಿಕೃತ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷವಾಗಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಅರ್ಹತೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿತ್ತು. ಆದಾಗ ಅಧಿಕೃತ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷವಾಗಿ ಮನ್ನಣೆ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಪ್ರಜಾಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಆವಕಾಶವಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ, ಎಸ್.ಎ.ಡಿ. ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ನಾಯಕನಾಗಿ ಇರಬೇಕು, ಪಿ.ಎಸ್.ಪಿ. ಪರವಾಗಿ ಮನ್ನಣೆ ಕೇಳಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದರು ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಲವಾದ ಒಂದು ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷವಿರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ಪಕ್ಷ ಬೆಳೆಯಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ನಾನು ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಜಾಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಮನ್ನಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಟ್ಟಾಗಿ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ಹೊತ್ತು ಕೂಡ ಎಸ್.ಎ.ಡಿ.ಗೆ ಸೇರಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ಹೊರೆಯಾಗಿ ರಚಿತವಾಗಿರುವ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ (ಆರ್) ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಆಹ್ವಾನವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ನಾನು ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕನಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ದೇಶದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಯಾವುದೇ ಪಕ್ಷ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲರಲಿ, ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸಿಂಡಿಕೇಟ್ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲರ ಬಹುದು, ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಇಂಡಿಕೇಟ್ ಡೆಲ್ಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲರಬಹುದು, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಯಾವ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅವರು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಿರುತ್ತದೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಹಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಬಹಿರಂಗವಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪಕ್ಷಪ್ರಜಾ ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಕ್ಷವೊಂದೇ. ಇವತ್ತು ಮೀರೇಂದ್ರ ಪಾಟೀಲರ ಸರಕಾರವೇ ಇರಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಯಾವ ಸರಕಾರವೇ ಇರಲಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಸಮಾಜವಾದ ಅನುಷ್ಠಾನ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪಿ.ಎಸ್.ವಿ. ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ತನ್ನ ನಿಲುವನ್ನೇ ತಾಳುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಹಿಂದುಮುಂದು ನೋಡದೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು ನಾನು ಫ್ಲೆಕ್ಸಿಬಲ್ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು.

4-00 P.M.

ಇದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕಳೆದ ಎಂಟು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರೇ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇರಲಿ ಖಡಾಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಅವರೊಡನೆ ಹೋರಾಟ ಮಾಡುವ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ನಾನು. ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರದೇ ಸರಕಾರ ಇರಲಿ, ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪನವರ ಸರಕಾರವೇ ಬರಲಿ, ಅವರೊಡನೆ ಖಡಾಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಹೋರಾಟ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಮೊದಲು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೊಡನೆ ಹೋರಾಟ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದು ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಮ್ಮ ಪವಿತ್ರ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಪವಿತ್ರ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ದೇವರು ನಮಗೆ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಸಾಮರ್ಥ್ಯ ಕೊಡಲಿ ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನನ್ನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು ಎರಡು ಒಳ್ಳೆ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಆಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಇಂದು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಶಕ್ತಿಯುತವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಮೀರಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನನಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಕೃತಜ್ಞತೆಯಿಂದ ವಂದನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಅರ್ಪಿಸಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I now request the Leaders and Whips of all the parties to co-operate with the Secretary, in allotting seats to various parties. The first front seat on the Opposition side goes to the Deputy Speaker. The other parties will be allotted blocks of seats. The actual arrangement of allotting individual seats within the allotted blocks is left to the Leaders and the Whips of the concerned parties. From to-morrow the new seating arrangements will come into force.

Now, the House is adjourned, to meet again to-morrow at 1-00 P.M.

The House adjourned at Three Minutes past Four of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Tuesday the 24th February 1970.